

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 94-161 are pending in this application. Claims 124-138 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Claims 94-161 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over WO 95/12275 to Cookson et al. (herein "Cookson") in view of U.S. patent 6,895,171 to Taira et al. (herein "Taira").

Initially, applicants note that in the comments supporting the rejection of claims 94-161 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Cookson in view of Taira, comments are also directed to an additional reference to Saita et al., particularly with respect to claims 135-161. However, at this point no reference to Saita has been cited or made of record in the present application, and it is unclear whether any such reference is actually being applied or not. Clarification of that issue is requested. Of course if any subsequent rejection is made based on the teachings in Saita applicants point out such a rejection should not be made Final as of this time applicants have not had an opportunity to address any reference to Saita.

Addressing now the rejection of claims 124-138 under 35 U.S.C. § 101, that rejection is traversed by the present response.

First, with respect to claims 124-134, those claims are directed to a computer readable recording medium that includes a computer program for recording a signal by different operations recited in those claims. Claims 124-134 thereby are not directed to descriptive material, but instead recite the different *operations* performed by the computer program, which is clearly statutory subject matter. The outstanding rejection appears to have misconstrued claims 124-134.

With respect to claims 135-138, applicants note those claims are directed to information stored on a processor readable information carrier, but applicants respectfully

submit those claims are clearly directed to a statutory device of a processor readable information carrier. Such an apparatus is clearly a physical article of manufacture.

In view of these foregoing comments, applicants respectfully submit claims 124-138 are proper under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

Addressing now the rejection of claims 94-161 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Cookson in view of Taira, that rejection is traversed by the present response.

Initially applicants note independent claim 94 is amended by the present response to clarify a feature recited therein. Independent claim 94 recites the control information positioned “in a segment” directly following an entry point of the video information, the “segment also including an independently coded I-frame first after the entry point”. According to such features, and with reference to Figure 5 in the present specification and the corresponding description in the present specification at page 29, line 5 et seq. as non-limiting examples, a video program includes an entry point 51 followed by a first segment 52. As noted in the present specification at page 30, line 1 et seq., after the entry point 51 the video signal first contains an I-frame. Such an I-frame is an independently coded frame, in comparison with a P-frame that is coded dependent by forward or backward computation or a B-frame that is bi-directionally coded.¹ The I-frame is independently coded. Claims 135-161 also recite similar features by reciting a “previous section entry point indicating entry to a first following independently coded I-frame”.

One feature in the claimed invention is to allow efficient location of an I-frame to facilitate high-speed search-type reproduction operations.² In the claimed invention the I-

¹ See for example the present specification at page 29, lines 13-22.

² See for example the present specification at page 31, lines 3-5.

frame first follows the entry point, and additionally the segment following the entry point includes control information.

The above-noted features reflected in each of claims 94-134 are believed to clearly distinguish over the applied art.

With respect to the primary applied art to Cookson, Cookson in Figures 7A-7B merely discloses the use of pointers. However, Cookson does not disclose or suggest any operation such as in the claimed invention in which an I-frame first follows an entry point. As noted above, in the claimed invention such an operation allows efficient location of I-frames in a high-speed search.

The outstanding Office Action now also cites Taira to disclose control information directly following an entry point. However, Taira does not cure the above-discussed deficiencies in Cookson in that Taira also does not disclose or suggest a segment “also including an independently coded I-frame first after the entry point” or an “entry point indicating entry to a first following independently coded I-frame”.

The outstanding rejection cites Figure 7, elements 97 and 99, and Figure 5, elements 82 and 84, of Taira to disclose a file management information preceding menu video data and a pack including a pack header and a packet. However, those disclosures in Taira are irrelevant to the claimed features. Those disclosures in Taira are not directed to an entry point as in the claimed invention. The entry point in the claimed invention provides easy access to an I-frame, which is not at all related to the disclosure in Taira.

In view of these foregoing comments applicants respectfully submit the claims as currently written clearly distinguish over the combination of teachings of Cookson in view of Taira.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.


Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

BDL:SNS\dt

I:\ATTY\SNS\27's\275917\275917US-AM1.DOC



Bradley D. Lytle
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 40,073

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423